REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-21 in the application. In previous responses, the Applicant amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 15. In the present response, no claims have been amended, canceled, or added. Accordingly, Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 14-16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 14-16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,375 to Shaffer, *et al.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Shaffer discloses data from a calling station 10 is transmitted on a telephone line 14 to a central office 16. (*See*, for example, column 2, lines 46-48 and Figure 1A.) In response, the central office 16 converts a received digital error message into the proper format to be decoded by the calling station 10. (*See*, for example, column 3, lines 47-49.) The calling station 10 decodes the digital error message and takes appropriate action. (*See*, for example, column 4, lines 16-23.) In some embodiments, a new phone number is also transmitted to the caller station 10. (*See* column 4, lines 49-55.) Thus, Shaffer teaches that a received digital error message decoded by the calling station determines an appropriate action for the calling station, such as redialing the number with an appropriate prefix, storing a new number and dialing it, *etc*.

The Examiner equates a call from the calling station <u>to</u> the circuit-switched telephone network as the first telephone call. (See Examiner's Action of September 12, 2007, page 3.)

Assuming *arguendo* this to be true, the telephone number to be dialed by Shaffer, however, is not

extracted from the first telephone call. Instead, the telephone number to be dialed is either a manipulation of an existing number residing in the calling station (for example, with a "1" prefix) based on a received digital error message or a number received from the central office to be stored and redialed by the calling station. Thus, Shaffer does not extract from a first telephone call a destination address for a subsequent telephone call as recited in independent Claims 1, 8, and 15. As such, Shaffer does not anticipate each and every element of amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §102(e) rejection of Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 14-16 and 21 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-21under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,760,324 to Scott, *et al.*, in view Shaffer. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner recognizes that Scott does not teach or suggest extracting a destination address for a subsequent telephone call. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner cites Shaffer. (See Examiner's Action of September 12, 2007, page 6.) As established above, Shaffer does not teach extracting from the first telephone call a destination address for a subsequent telephone call as recited in independent Claims 1, 8, and 15. Furthermore, Shaffer does not suggest the same since Shaffer is directed to detecting and responding to errors in telephone calls over a circuit-switched network and is not even concerned with establishing a telephone call over a computer network. As such, the cited combination of Scott and Shaffer does not provide a prima facie case of

obviousness for independent Claims 1, 8, and 15 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-21 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Scott in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,110,395 by Blair. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Again, the Examiner recognizes that Scott does not teach or suggest extracting a destination address for a subsequent telephone call. Here, instead of Shaffer, the Examiner cites Blair to cure this deficiency. (See Examiner's Action of September 12, 2007, page 10.) However, the Applicant fails to find where Blair teaches or suggest extracting a destination address for a subsequent telephone call. Blair teaches that once connected to a network, a destination phone connects to a server or site that allows the destination phone to identify a network address of an originating phone. (See, for example, column 1, lines 56-59.) Thus, Blair teaches that the destination phones discovers an originating phone's network address from a server or site instead of extracting if from calling identification signals from the originating phone. Blair, therefore, does not teach or suggest extracting a destination address from calling number identification signals received from a first telephone call over a circuit-switched telephone network as currently recited in independent Claims 1, 8, and 15.

As such, Blair does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Scott. Therefore, the cited combination of Scott and Blair does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of Claims 1, 8,

and 15 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the

Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-21 and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the Claims

currently pending in this application are in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a

Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-21.

Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972)

480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The

Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account

08-2395.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

/J. Joel Justiss/

J. Joel Justiss

Registration No. 48,981

Dated: December 12, 2007

P.O. Box 832570

Richardson, Texas 75083

(972) 480-8800

5